UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,401	03/31/2004	Richard R. Hollowbush	1121-73 (D4781-00078)	5381

			EXAMINER
8933	7590	09/08/2006	CHOW, JEFFREY J

DUANE MORRIS, LLP
IP DEPARTMENT
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2628	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/814,401	HOLLOWBUSH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey J. Chow	2628	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 June 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 18-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 18-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 June 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 14 and 18 – 20 filed 01 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Krishnamurthy does not teach the formatted display output should be arranged to select some part of the picture to be an area of particular scrutiny so as to highlight or focus scrutiny on the area of the error, or to selectively change the nature of the data that is displayed when an error is detected (page 8). Krishnamurthy discloses amplitude, saturation and frequency errors are checked (column 2, lines 8 – 30) and a NEXT or PREV button moves the cursor 36 to the next or previous pixel that exhibited an error of the selected type (column 3, lines 36 – 40). This clearly shows that Krishnamurthy performs some form of criterion test and automatically goes from one pixel with error to another pixel with error.

Applicant argues that Krishnamurthy and Lau do not teach attributes applied as criteria to determine an area of scrutiny, and to switch the formatted output display to a different selection of display types when the criteria are met. Krishnamurthy discloses amplitude, saturation and frequency errors are checked (column 2, lines 8 – 30). This clearly shows attributes applied as criteria to determine an area of scrutiny. Krishnamurthy discloses amplitude, saturation and frequency errors are checked (column 2, lines 8 – 30) and a NEXT or PREV button moves the cursor 36 to the next or previous pixel that exhibited an error of the selected type (column 3, lines 36 – 40). This clearly shows switching the formatted output display to a different selection of display types when the criteria are met.

Applicant argues that Krishnamurthy does not suggest on any particular sort of error

might be used as a trigger to switch to a different set of content types in the formatted display

(pages 9 and 10). Krishnamurthy discloses amplitude, saturation and frequency errors are

checked (column 2, lines 8 – 30) and a NEXT or PREV button moves the cursor 36 to the next or

previous pixel that exhibited an error of the selected type (column 3, lines 36 – 40).

The drawing objections have been withdrawn due to applicant's amendments to the

drawings and arguments.

The abstract objection has been withdrawn due to applicant's amendment to the abstract.

The specification objections have been withdrawn due to applicant's arguments.

The claim objections have been withdrawn due to applicant's arguments.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejections has been withdrawn due to applicant's

arguments.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejections has been withdrawn due to applicant's

arguments.

Specification

The amendment filed 01 June 2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it

introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall

introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not

supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "counted pixel coordinates" is new matter.

The original specification filed 31 March 2004 discloses "counted pixel coordinates".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 14 and 18 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Krishnamurthy et al. (US 5,469,188) in view of Lau et al. (US 6,525,746).

Regarding independent claim 1, Krishnamurthy discloses that the video file can be stored

on the computer system 10, in the frame buffer of the DSP 20, and in the video recorder 22

(Column 2, lines 52 – 67 and Fig. 1) and the computer system 10 is coupled to a digital

processing system (DPS) 20 that includes at least one frame buffer, which reads on the claimed

video input signal providing a video signal to be analyzed, the video input signal including at

least one of successive picture frames and fields containing a video picture. Krishnamurthy also

discloses the DPS 20 is coupled to a video recorder 22 together with an associated component

video monitor 24 (Column 2, lines 52 – 67 and Fig. 1), which reads on the claimed video

processor operable to produce a display of information at least partly from the video input signal.

Krishnamurthy discloses a computer system 10 that has a central processor 12, a display 14 and

an interface 16, such as a keyboard and mouse (Column 2, lines 52 – 67 and Fig. 1), which reads

on the claimed controller coupled to the video processor and to at least one control input, the

controller being operable to control the information displayed by the video processor. The

computer system 10 is capable to control the information displayed by the DPS 20.

Krishnamurthy further discloses a display window 32 of panel display 30 (Column 3, lines 16 -

19 and Fig. 2), which reads on the claimed full representation of the video picture contained in

the video input signal selectively presented so as to occupy at least a portion of a display area of

the formatted display. Krishnamurthy discloses below the display window 32 are status

windows 37 that indicate the digital component values (YBR) of the pixel and includes pixel

swatches of the pixel including the immediately preceding and following pixels on the same

horizontal line (Column 3, lines 21 - 31 and Fig. 2), which reads on the claimed zoom image

including an area of particular scrutiny in said video picture selectively presented so as to occupy

at least a portion of the display area of the formatted display. Krishnamurthy discloses the status

windows 37 that display various characteristics of the pixels, which reads on the claimed report

of the video data characteristics of at least one point within the area of particular scrutiny.

Krishnamurthy discloses the input video 32, the status window 37 and the zoomed area of the

area of particular scrutiny in the status window 37 (Figure 2), which reads on the claimed a

subset of said full representation, said zoom image and said report. Krishnamurthy discloses

errors are displayed in respective windows for each test and a NEXT or PREV button moves the

cursor 36 to the next or previous pixel that exhibited an error of the selected type (column 3,

lines 36 – 40), which reads on the claimed video processor is operable to change the area of

particular scrutiny so as to select for video data characteristics meeting predetermined criteria.

Krishnamurthy did not disclose the video processor is operable to produce a formatted display of

selectable data images for presentation on a display device wherein the formatted display

comprises a selection of one of a full representation of the video picture, a zoom image, and a

report of video data characteristics. Krishnamurthy also did not disclose a separate zoom window. Lau discloses various display windows 54-62, a main window 50, within which a user selects one or more subordinate windows 52, each of which may be concurrently active at a given time (Column 7, lines 28 – 33 and Figure 3). Lau also discloses the subordinate windows 52 may be opened or closed, moved or resized (Column 7, lines 33 – 34 and Figure 3). Lau also discloses the subordinate windows 52, comprises of a video window 54, a zoom window 56, and one or more data windows 62 (Column 7, lines 40 – 43 and Figure 3). The selectable zoom window 56 relates to the claimed zoom image that can be selectively displayed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine Krishnamurthy's system with Lau's teachings of a zoom window 56 and a video window 54 in order to display the input video signal and the zoomed portion of the input video signal at the same time, which would give the user better analysis of the video input signal. It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to further combine Krishnamurthy's system with Lau's teachings of selectable displays in order to allow the display window 32 and the selectable status window 37 of Krishnamurthy's system to be opened, closed, resized and moved or selectively displayed, which would give the user increased flexibility in viewing the desired information.

Regarding dependent claim 2, this claim additionally recites a plurality of display modes in which there are at least two images of particular scrutiny. At least one of, two of, or all of the selectable display window 32, the selectable status window 37, the selectable zoom window 56 (Lau) can be displayed in different variations, which relates to the claimed display modes.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Krishnamurthy in combination of Lau discloses the display

window 32, the status window 37 and the zoom window 56 (Lau) are presented at different parts

of the display device and present progressively smaller parts, the display window 32 being the

largest displayed area and the status window 37 being the smallest display area, which reads on

the claimed video processor has a display mode wherein the full representation of the video

picture, the zoom image and the report of said video data characteristics are presented at different

parts of the display device and present progressively smaller parts of the area of particular

scrutiny.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Krishnamurthy discloses the information of the pixel

displayed in the selectable status window 37 (Figure 2), which reads on the claimed tabular

display, which in the disclosure of the disclosed invention the tabular display just shows

information of the pixel data.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Krishnamurthy further discloses the selectable status

window 37 that indicate the (X,Y) pixel location (POS) of the cursor 36 (Column 3, lines 21 – 30

and Fig. 2), which relates to the claimed sample location information and color sample data.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Krishnamurthy discloses the pixel swatches in the

selectable status window 37 (Column 3, lines 21 - 31 and Fig. 2), which reads on the claimed

color swatch of the color sample data.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Krishnamurthy further discloses a digital component

domain image is stored in the frame buffer of the DPS 20 (Column 2, lines 61 – 63) and errors

are displayed in respective windows for each test and a NEXT or PREV button moves the cursor

36 to the next or previous pixel that exhibited an error of the selected type (column 3, lines 36 –

40). The frame buffer of the DPS 20 relates to the claimed digital video signal. It is inherent

that a digitized video signal increments at least one frame at a time and that each frame contains

at least one of discrete sample data and discrete color state elements defining pixels, which reads

on the claimed video input signal contains a digital video signal with successive picture frames

and the video processor produces the formatted display repetitively for increments of at least one

frame, from one of discrete sample data and discrete color state elements defining pixels in the

video input signal.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Krishnamurthy discloses the video recorder 22, which

relates to the claimed video sampler. The video recorder 22 is operable to produce a digitized

video signal. It is inherent that a digitized video signal increments at least one frame at a time

and that each frame contains at least one of discrete sample data and discrete color state elements

defining pixels and Krishnamurthy discloses errors are displayed in respective windows for each

test and a NEXT or PREV button moves the cursor 36 to the next or previous pixel that exhibited

an error of the selected type (column 3, lines 36 – 40), which reads on the claimed video

processor produces the formatted display for increments of at least one frame from one of

discrete sample data and discrete color state elements defining pixels in the video input signal.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Lau discloses a zoom window and where it well known

and expected in the art to resize a window (Figure 3) and Krishnamurthy discloses a status

window 37 (Figure 2), which reads on the claimed video processor is operable to resize at least

part of the video picture for presentation in part of an area of the formatted display that occupies

less than a full area of the formatted display, and wherein resizing by the video processor

includes at least one of recalculating pixel values, sampling pixel values and reading out selected
pixel values.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Krishnamurthy in combination of Lau allows users to
manually select from the input video signal an area in the selectable display window 32 of panel
display 30 by using the interface 16, such as a keyboard and a mouse, to select the area of
particular scrutiny. The DPS 20 is capable of simultaneously display the input video signal to
the selectable display window 32 and the selectable zoom window 56 (Lau) of the area of
particularly scrutiny, which reads on the claimed control input is operable by a user manually to
select from the video input signal an area to be the area of particular scrutiny, and wherein the
video processor is operable simultaneously to present the video picture and the zoom image
including the area of particular scrutiny, in different areas of said formatted display.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Krishnamurthy in combination of Lau allows users to
manually select from the input video signal an area in the selectable display window 32 of panel
display 30 by using the interface 16, such as a keyboard and a mouse, to select the area of
particular scrutiny. The DPS 20 is capable of simultaneously display the input video signal to
the selectable display window 32 and the selectable zoom window 56 (Lau) of the area of
particularly scrutiny, which reads on the claimed video processor allots the formatted display to
accommodate said selection.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Krishnamurthy discloses errors are displayed in
respective windows for each test and a NEXT or PREV button moves the cursor 36 to the next or
previous pixel that exhibited an error of the selected type (column 3, lines 36 – 40), which reads
on the claimed video processor is operable responsive to the control input to define a selection

criteria and automatically to select from the video input signal at least one said area of particular scrutiny based upon data in the video input signal meeting said selection criteria.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Krishnamurthy discloses errors are displayed in respective windows for each test and a NEXT or PREV button moves the cursor 36 to the next or previous pixel that exhibited an error of the selected type (column 3, lines 36 – 40) and where the user manually position the cursor on the input video and where the user can select the NEXT or PREV button and the processor automatically positions the cursor the an error in the input video and where the clicking of the NEXT or PREV button sets the limited period of time, which reads on the claimed controller and the video processor are operable to coordinate between automatic and manual selection of the area of particular scrutiny, wherein said manual selection supersedes automatic selection at least for a limited period of time.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Krishnamurthy discloses an amplitude check in where each color component of each pixel in the RGB domain is checked to determine whether the value is within predetermined limits (column 3, line 50 – column 4, line 14), which reads on the claimed selection criteria for said automatic selection include a color gamut value criterion having at least one threshold value such that a value meeting the threshold value criterion is selected for particular scrutiny.

Regarding independent claim 18, Krishnamurthy discloses a display window 32 of panel display 30 (Column 3, lines 16 - 19 and Fig. 2), which reads on the claimed full presentation of a video picture contained in a video input signal, placed in an area less than a full area of the formatted display. Krishnamurthy discloses errors are displayed in respective windows for each test and a NEXT or PREV button moves the cursor 36 to the next or previous pixel that exhibited

an error of the selected type (column 3, lines 36 – 40), which reads on the claimed visual

presentation selectively including at least one cursor identifying in the video picture on the

formatted display an area of particular scrutiny containing at least one pixel defined by one of a

sample value. Krishnamurthy discloses below the display window 32 are status windows 37 that

indicate the digital component values (YBR) of the pixel and includes pixel swatches of the pixel

including the immediately preceding and following pixels on the same horizontal line (Column

3, lines 21 - 31 and Fig. 2), which reads on the claimed zoom image in which a limited part of

the video picture is placed in an areas less than the full area of the formatted display and wherein

the zoom image selectively corresponds to the area of particular scrutiny and the claimed discrete

minimum size zone. Krishnamurthy discloses the status windows 37 that display various

characteristics of the pixels, which reads on the claimed pixel information area containing a

numerical analysis applied to at least one said pixel identified by the cursor. Krishnamurthy

discloses errors are displayed in respective windows for each test and a NEXT or PREV button

moves the cursor 36 to the next or previous pixel that exhibited an error of the selected type

(column 3, lines 36 – 40) and where the user manually position the cursor on the input video and

where the user can select the NEXT or PREV button and the processor automatically positions

the cursor the an error in the input video and where the clicking of the NEXT or PREV button

sets the limited period of time and where amplitude, saturation and frequency errors are checked

(column 2, lines 8 – 30), which reads on the claimed processing apparatus is operable to change

at least one of a position of the cursor, the area of particular scrutiny and the numerical analysis

responsive to at least one of a user input and an automatic selection criteria. Krishnamurthy did

not disclose the windows being selectable. Krishnamurthy also did not disclose a separate zoom

window. Lau discloses various display windows 54-62, a main window 50, within which a user

selects one or more subordinate windows 52, each of which may be concurrently active at a

given time (Column 7, lines 28 – 33 and Figure 3). Lau also discloses the subordinate windows

52 may be opened or closed, moved or resized (Column 7, lines 33 – 34 and Figure 3). Lau also

discloses the subordinate windows 52, comprises of a video window 54, a zoom window 56, and

one or more data windows 62 (Column 7, lines 40 – 43 and Figure 3). The selectable zoom

window 56 relates to the claimed zoom image that can be selectively displayed. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine

Krishnamurthy's system with Lau's teachings of a zoom window 56 and a video window 54 in

order to display the input video signal and the zoomed portion of the input video signal at the

same time, which would give the user better analysis of the video input signal. It would have

also been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to further

combine Krishnamurthy's system with Lau's teachings of selectable displays in order to allow

the display window 32 and the selectable status window 37 of Krishnamurthy's system to be

opened, closed, resized and moved or selectively displayed, which would give the user increased

flexibility in viewing the desired information.

Regarding dependent claim 19, it is inherent that in Krishnamurthy's system, a digitized

video signal increments at least one frame at a time and that each frame contains at least one of

discrete sample data and discrete color state elements defining pixels, which reads on the

claimed video input signal contains successive picture frames with changing pixel values.

Krishnamurthy discloses a display device 14 (Figure 1), which reads on the claimed video

processor coupled to a display device for presenting said formatted display. Krishnamurthy

discloses a computer system 10 that has a central processor 12, a display 14 and an interface 16,

such as a keyboard and mouse (Column 2, lines 52 – 67 and Fig. 1), which reads on the claimed

controller coupled to the video processor and to at least one control input. Krishnamurthy

discloses errors are displayed in respective windows for each test and a NEXT or PREV button

moves the cursor 36 to the next or previous pixel that exhibited an error of the selected type

(column 3, lines 36 – 40) and where the user manually position the cursor on the input video and

where the user can select the NEXT or PREV button and the processor automatically positions

the cursor the an error in the input video and where the clicking of the NEXT or PREV button

sets the limited period of time and where amplitude, saturation and frequency errors are checked

(column 2, lines 8 – 30), which reads on the claimed controller is operable responsive to the

control input to apply a selection criteria for at least temporarily changing said position of the

cursor, said area of particular scrutiny and said numerical analysis to encompass at least one of

said pixel values based on the selection criteria.

Regarding independent claim 20, Krishnamurthy discloses a display device 14 (Figure 1),

which reads on the claimed providing a multi-format display having a display device with a

display area. Krishnamurthy discloses a display window 32 of panel display 30 (Column 3, lines

16 - 19 and Fig. 2) and the selectable status window 37 that indicate the (X,Y) pixel location

(POS) of the cursor 36 (Column 3, lines 21 – 30 and Fig. 2), which reads on the claimed

displaying the video picture in a formatted display occupying at least in part of the display area,

and providing a cursor for identifying a position in the video picture. Krishnamurthy discloses

below the display window 32 are status windows 37 that indicate the digital component values

(YBR) of the pixel and includes pixel swatches of the pixel including the immediately preceding

and following pixels on the same horizontal line (Column 3, lines 21 - 31 and Fig. 2), which

reads on the claimed selectively enlarging and selectively displaying in the formatted display an

area of particular scrutiny in the video at and around the position identified by the cursor.

Krishnamurthy discloses the status windows 37 that display various characteristics of the pixels,

which reads on the claimed numerically representing pixel information for at least one pixel

associated with the cursor. Krishnamurthy discloses errors are displayed in respective windows

for each test and a NEXT or PREV button moves the cursor 36 to the next or previous pixel that

exhibited an error of the selected type (column 3, lines 36 – 40) and where the user manually

position the cursor on the input video and where the user can select the NEXT or PREV button

and the processor automatically positions the cursor the an error in the input video and where the

clicking of the NEXT or PREV button sets the limited period of time, which reads on the

claimed selectively controlling, both manually and automatically, at least one of the position of

the cursor and a content of the formatted display, for at least temporarily directing the formatted

display to a different area of particular scrutiny determined according to a selection criterion.

Krishnamurthy did not disclose the windows being selectable. Krishnamurthy also did not

disclose a separate zoom window. Lau discloses various display windows 54-62, a main window

50, within which a user selects one or more subordinate windows 52, each of which may be

concurrently active at a given time (Column 7, lines 28 – 33 and Figure 3). Lau also discloses

the subordinate windows 52 may be opened or closed, moved or resized (Column 7, lines 33 –

34 and Figure 3). Lau also discloses the subordinate windows 52, comprises of a video window

54, a zoom window 56, and one or more data windows 62 (Column 7, lines 40 – 43 and Figure

3). The selectable zoom window 56 relates to the claimed zoom image that can be selectively

displayed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Krishnamurthy's system with Lau's teachings of a zoom window 56 and a

video window 54 in order to display the input video signal and the zoomed portion of the input

video signal at the same time, which would give the user better analysis of the video input signal.

It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to

further combine Krishnamurthy's system with Lau's teachings of selectable displays in order to

allow the display window 32 and the selectable status window 37 of Krishnamurthy's system to

be opened, closed, resized and moved or selectively displayed, which would give the user

increased flexibility in viewing the desired information.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey J. Chow whose telephone number is (571)-272-8078. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00AM - 5:00PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on (571)-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JJC

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600